

## REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are pending. Claims 1-60 are rejected.

Claim 1 was objected to due to noted informalities. Applicants has amended claim 1 to address the noted informalities. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn with respect to claim 1.

To expedite prosecution and/or to clarify the subject matter therein, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 13, 28, 32, 52 and 57.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, for example, “use a key to index one of said locations wherein the key is a predefined portion of the packet destination address associated with said indexed location via at least an offset in address space,” “wherein the memory structure implements memory arbitration for at least six types of memory accesses, and wherein the memory structure facilitates full-duplex, non-blocked Ethernet switch operations at wire speeds.”

Claim 8 has been amended to recite, for example, “wherein the Address Resolution Table is configured to resolve addresses in a packet-based network switch and to use a key and an offset in address space to index one of said locations within the Address Resolution Table” and “wherein the memory structure implements a weighted priority, round-robin memory arbitration technique.”

Claim 13 has been amended to recite, for example, “wherein the key comprises a predefined portion of a packet destination address associated with the indexed location through at least an offset in address space” and “wherein the memory structure implements a weighted priority, round-robin memory arbitration technique.”

Claim 28 has been amended to recite, for example, “a key and an offset in address space to index one of said locations within the Address Resolution Table” and “wherein the packet-based switch performs full-duplex, non-blocked Ethernet switch operations at wire speed.”

Claim 32 has been amended to recite, for example, “wherein the Address Resolution Table is configured to resolve addresses in a packet-based network switch and use a key to index

one of said locations using at least an offset in address space” and “wherein the memory structure facilitates full-duplex, non-blocked Ethernet switch operations at wire speed.”

Claim 52 has been amended to recite, for example, “wherein the Address Resolution Table is configured to use a key to index a one of said locations within the Address Resolution Table using at least an offset in address space” and “wherein the packet-based switch performs full-duplex, non-blocked Ethernet switch operations at wire speed.”

Claim 57 has been amended to recite, for example, “wherein the Address Resolution Table is configured to resolve addresses in a packet-based network switch, and to use a key and an offset in address space to index a one of said locations,” “wherein the packet-based switch makes a transmit descriptor request during a transmission of a previous frame, and wherein the packet-based switch facilitates full-duplex, non-blocked Ethernet switch operations at wire speed.”

In view of at least the amendments to independent claims 1, 8, 13, 28, 32, 52 and 57, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented in view of the combination of cited documents, as asserted, in the Office Action Made Final mailed October 28, 2008.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 13, 28, 32, 52 and 57 and their respective rejected dependent claims.

Applicants do not necessarily agree or disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of the documents made of record, either alone or in combination, or the Examiner’s characterization of recited claim elements. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue the characterization of the documents of record, either alone or in combination, to argue what is allegedly well known, allegedly obvious or allegedly disclosed, or the characterization of the recited claim elements should that need arise in the future.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue, without prejudice, subject matter that has been withdrawn, amended and/or cancelled in a continuing and/or related application.

U.S. Application No. 09/492,265, filed January 27, 2000

Attorney Docket No. 20218US02

Amendment dated July 6, 2009

Accompanying Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed July 6, 2009

With respect to the present application, Applicants hereby rescind any disclaimer of claim scope made in the parent application or any predecessor or related application. The Examiner is advised that any previous disclaimer of claim scope, if any, and the alleged prior art that it was made to allegedly avoid, may need to be revisited. Nor should a disclaimer of claim scope, if any, in the present application be read back into any predecessor or related application.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, to charge any fee deficiencies or to credit any overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Date: July 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael T. Cruz/

Michael T. Cruz

Reg. No. 44,636

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.

500 West Madison Street, Suite 3400

Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000

Facsimile: (312) 775-8100